

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully reviewed the application in light of the final Office Action dated January 31, 2007. Applicant amends Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-19, 21-23, 33 and 35-37. The amendments to the claims have only been done to expedite the prosecution.

Examiner Interview

Applicant interviewed the Examiner on April 30, 2007 regarding the Section 103 rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,643,623 issued to Kolls (hereinafter “*Kolls*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,559 issued to Meier (hereinafter “*Meier*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the comments set forth below.

For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the claimed in-store controller is “configured to authorize fueling transactions based, at least in part, on wireless messages and to wirelessly manage service devices configured to provide services in the retail fueling environment.” In addition, the claimed in-store controller communication module is configured to receive wireless messages from “a plurality of client modules.” For at least these reasons, the *Kolls- Meier* fails to teach the limitations of claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent Claims 14, 17, 33, and 47 recite limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitation of Claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, these claims are allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Claims 15-16, 18-32, 34-46, and 48-56 each depend from one of independent Claim 14, 17, 33, and 47 and are thus also patentable over the cited art.

The Office Action rejects Claims 6, 8, 16, 23, 30, 32, 36, 43, 45, 46, and 49-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kolls* in view of *Meier* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,603 (“*Dickson*”). Claims 6, 8, 16, 23, 30, 32, 36, 43, 45, 46, and 49-56 are allowable at least because each depends from one of independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 33, and 47

Applicant : David Kenneth Blanchard
Serial No. : 09/911,570
Filed : July 23, 2001
Page : 15 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 15828-058001 / PE-00-012

which have been shown above to be allowable. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to cite a teaching or suggestion in *Dickson* of the missing limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6, 8, 16, 23, 30, 32, 36, 43, 45, 46, and 49-56.

Applicant : David Kenneth Blanchard
Serial No. : 09/911,570
Filed : July 23, 2001
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 15828-058001 / PE-00-012

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2007

/Michael E. Cox/

Michael E. Cox
Reg. No. 47,505

Customer No.: **26231**
Fish & Richardson P.C.

Direct Phone: (214) 760-6107
Fax: (214) 747-2091